

3/9/86



PC16/10/5/1/129

1

It should be clear that no single person -- particularly, a white, English-speaking, male, graduate -- can speak for "South Africa". Indeed, even if one did not suffer these obvious disadvantages, one would be reluctant to speak for South Africa since it is not entirely clear anymore that there exists consensus on what constitutes "South Africa". At the present time, perhaps the only consensus on "South Africa" is that it fills a space on a map. This issue of consensus is crucial to what this Conference is designed to consider: if there were consensus on goals for this society -- let's call it South Africa -- there would be little need for the present gathering.

What this one individual can safely do is attempt a response to what my learned colleague has said in his remarks. Of necessity, this response will be both fragmentary and controversial. For the former, I take responsibility, along with the organisers of this Conference. I make no apology for the controversial nature of these remarks: the national crisis is too serious for us to be pussyfooting about with the future of our country, our profession and the institutions we hold dear.

It is clear that the so-called Open Universities are open only in a very limited sense; it is not altogether certain that they should enjoy such a title, which they have themselves chosen. By this self-anointment, they communicate to themselves and to the world at large that they embrace a set of academic principles

which are the lifeblood of the university experience in what we commonly understand as the "western democracies". To a large extent, our open universities have been clones of non-African academic institutions -- they have not, therefore, been African, nor, for that matter, have they been Afrikaner.

This too is relevant to what this conference is considering. The Open universities were established at a time when, to all intents and purposes, some broad consensus existed on the traditions and values of western culture, which formed the center of this university experience. Together with the Afrikaans Universities, the English universities were part of a single world culture -- what we might call the "one-world" culture.

The retreat of the Afrikaans universities behind the ideological curtain of Apartheid was completed by the passing of the Universities Extension Act of 1959, and this event meant that they largely thereafter turned their backs on the one-world culture, pursuing their own Afrikaner culture. The Open Universities have continued to claim membership of this one-world culture and when that culture faltered -- as it did with the collapse of colonialism -- they claimed membership in a wider university experience which was mainly Scottish/Oxbridge and, later, American in its orientation.

The issues before us today go to the heart of the question of how

we, as a collective of scholars, can survive intellectually given the ideological straitjacketing of successive South African governments, from Dr. Malan to PW Botha. The dilemmas faced by the open universities are immense. If this were not enough, the open universities are also recognizing that the present order is in the process of disintegration and that they -- not for the lack of trying -- have not adequately prepared the ground for what is to follow. It is a difficult time in which to live as an individual, and a more difficult time to survive as a scholar.

There are two main responses to the pressures which the open universities face, and I believe that proponents of each will emerge from all of South Africa's universities. In other words, it will not be possible neatly to characterise those at English universities as being on one side, and those at Afrikaans universities as being on the other. All too often there is a feeling of smugness in the open universities -- the sentiment that English-speaking scholars command the high ground over their Afrikaner colleagues both intellectually and morally, in their opposition to apartheid. This is a most unfortunate trait.

For the moment, I want to leave the so-called "bush colleges" -- including Unitra and Unibo -- out of these remarks. They are important but, arguably, as the fiscal crisis facing the present government deepens, rationalisation will take place and these will wither like so many other twigs on the Apartheid vine. Of

course this is debateable, but let's leave them out for the sake of the argument.

For reasons which will become clear, we can call the first response "Incorporation" and the second response we will call "Toward the New Frontier". Let us be clear that what we eventually experience may not be as stark as this neat bifurcation suggests: As always in social affairs, the real truth is likely to lie in the areas between the cracks -- certainly, survival may lie in those spaces.

First, "Incorporation". Clearly, the present rulers of this country have sought to ensure their survival both by entrenching their power through constitutional means and through the establishment, as far as they are able, of what political scientists call the "corporate state". For the purposes at hand, it is sufficient to define such a state as one in which as many activities as possible are brought into the ambit of the state's control. Activities which cannot, through legislation, be siezed by the growing tentacles of the state, are often simply destroyed by state repression. In contemporary South Africa, there is no clearer example of the former than the Tricameral Parliament, and no more stark instance of the latter than the current state of emergency, which -- in the opinion of many, including the Minister of Law and Order -- is aimed at smashing all extra-Parliamentary opposition.

Corporatism has huge implications for our universities: the State will increasingly seek to draft the universities into its service by means both fair and foul. Many academics will be tempted to join the service of the State in its determination to survive. The motives for their cooperation will vary widely, depending upon circumstances and disciplines. One can see for example, that engineers will benefit from the research contracts which will become -- and may already have become -- available through ARMSCOR, the Atomic Energy Board or ISCOR.

Political scientists will also be tempted into the State's service by the belief that they can help "save" South Africa by inventing yet another new consitutional model, one which will be seized by the governing party and lead, I'm afraid, to yet another political cul-de-sac. Indeed, many in this trade have already gone down this path, among which this government's ambassador to London, Denis Worrall, is the best example. In time, all the major academic disciplines, from Education to Ecology, from Physics to Physical Education, from Geography to Genetics could be pressed into the service of the State in one form or another.

In this role, the university would be the handmaiden of the State. The state's immense patronage -- and its control of the purse strings -- will make it very difficult for the universities

or for individual academics to resist playing this role. Indeed, recent SAPSE proposals on requiring us to publish in specified income-generating publications, represent obvious efforts to control both thought and its dissemination.

Where the resistance is strongest, the State will attempt to invoke patriotism, blowing a familiar bugle. Those who refuse to succumb to these inducements will be branded communists or enemies of the state.

It is possible that many in the Open universities will seek a compromise with the State on the issue of incorporation. They will believe that they can continue to operate within the system and, at the same time, retain their individual academic integrity. In a sense, this is the balancing act which the open universities have been performing for the better part of three decades, and in which they have been fairly successful.

It seems to me, that what we have operated in this way out of a belief -- clearly, a sincere belief -- that our respective disciplines are value-free, and that the chief duty of the scholar is to pursue the truth. I am increasingly unconvinced that somehow we can achieve this academic ideal. Values -- in South Africa's case, deeply ingrained racial values -- penetrate every aspect of our lives. We are no less free and unfettered from their influence than are people outside the universities.

For example, two complementary ideologies have in recent times been systematically propagated by the South African government: anti-communism and free enterprise. Both are extremely value-laden. If these twin ideologies underpin our educational system to the extent I suspect they do, then we, who work in the social sciences have an urgent duty to question whether -- if at all -- we can sincerely do research or teach in our chosen fields.

My consideration of these two issues leads me to the issue of sanctions where, in many ways, the rub of "incorporation" will be most keenly felt by those in political science. We can anticipate a deluge of work on the sanctions issue, and those who have been incorporated within the structures of the state will no doubt launch a new "Rhodesian-syndrome" -- a complex mythology concerning sanctions, their busting, their duplicity, and their folly. Certainly in International Relations -- the sub-discipline with which I am most familiar -- this will be a major growth industry. Consider for a moment, however, just how foolish and self-serving this exercise will be since it is regarded as an offense -- in terms of the emergency and under the ordinary law of the land -- to advocate sanctions.

The question which the open universities are asking the international community is, "What would you now have us do to call the dogs off?" It is not altogether surprising that this

question should be asked, given that the open universities have, as I have argued, long sought to establish themselves as part of the wider university community. Moreover, the universities have consistently opposed the determined efforts of successive Nationalist governments to crush their independence. If members of the international community of scholars turn their backs on we who have worked so hard to defend our academic freedom, will they not themselves be engaging in academic discrimination?

This is the heart of what is at issue in this debate. The near universal condemnation of the institutionalized racial separation of people in South Africa, and the extraordinary efforts which South Africa's present rulers have made to ensure their predominance have given this country a special place in the affairs of mankind. Since Jack Spence is a greater authority on the issue of South Africa's international unpopularity, I will not attempt at this point to enter the debate on double standards, and I hope that you will direct any questions in that regard to him. What concerns me here is that our international colleagues are expecting from us more than merely symbolic opposition to apartheid. They are looking for action. They are looking to us for ideas about how to initiate a process of change in which the values that they -- and we -- share play a determining role. They will judge us on this action.

To accept the alternative which I have called "Toward the New

"Frontier" is to reject absolutely the state's overtures for incorporation. Those who choose this path believe that the present social system is totally unacceptable, and that genuine prosperity and security for all the citizens of our country lie in the clear, unequivocal acceptance that there is a non-racial alternative for what we now know as South Africa.

There is of course a fairly rich body of local literature on what role the South African university -- particularly, the open university -- might play in the present situation. (Let me refer here to the collection edited by James Moulder entitled, "University and Community," and published as Philosophical Papers, Monograph Series, No. 2, June 1980, as well as to Philosophical Papers, Vol VIII, No. 1, May 1979, which includes important articles by Dworkin, Suzman, Drkin, and Geoff Budlender.) I must confess that while reading these, I was comforted to know that others had treaded the path to the "new frontier" before me. I do not want to analyse those debates, but rather to draw selectively from them.

First, it is clear to me that the universities should take the lead in raising the level of educational attainment of all our people. Universities possess vast pools of human and intellectual material, which the great mass of our people do not possess; indeed, they have been denied access to this material for many generations. Just last week, Ismail Mohammed, at the DCS

Oosthuizen Academic Freedom Lecture at Rhodes, reminded us that " While the vast mass of our youth are struggling to acquire rudimentary knowledge of reading and writing, there are those who could reach out to an understanding of the universe, theories of an expanding universe and black holes millions of light years away. While the vast mass of our black youth lack the most elementary knowledge of health and hygiene and are the victims of the diseases of malnutrition and poverty, there are those who can reach out to an understanding of the very basis of life, of DNA molecules and genetic materials and the behavior of chemical messages and electric pulses in nerve endings, determining communications between nerve cells."

Of course the universities are not responsible for this situation. Nevertheless, on a per capita basis, they have been the main beneficiaries of the state's educational largesse and therefore must share a large part of the responsibility for meeting the growing crisis in elementary and secondary education. It seems clear that the international community will in part judge our performance by how successfully we relate to the community about us, and by how we contribute to the education of all our citizens. It is of course true that we should not ultimately be devoting ourselves to these educational tasks for the sake of international acclaim; it is far more important that we do so because we believe that it is in the interests of our own country and our own people.

Clearly, significant contributions have been made in the field of education by many South African educationalists. For example, when we look at the respect with which the SACHED Trust is viewed both by the mass of our people and by many abroad, we ought to recognize that important alternative routes to educational upliftment are viable. While in my opinion the jury is still out on the Khanya College experiment, I think that the verdict will be a positive one. If so, it will be an important model for our universities to emulate.

The universities should be a catalyst for change within our society. In practice, this means providing extra-parliamentary opponents of apartheid with the necessary tools in their struggle to overcome the present structure. Research and administrative skills are just two such tools that spring to mind. I realise, of course, that no discussion of this kind of assistance could be complete without considering the question of violence. Is it any less correct, for example, to help the ANC build a limpet mine than it is to help ARMSCOR assemble a bomb? These are the kinds of questions which, I think, individuals cannot openly answer, but they are questions which need to be asked. Many of our younger colleagues are already supporting people involved directly in the struggle against Apartheid.

It is further clear to me that the universities should become the chief arena for serious discussion of what South Africa without racial discrimination ought to look like. This debate has, of course, already begun, but it has been quite muted on the campuses, partially, I believe, because of the intense ideological tension which debates of this kind engender. In light of this, it is encouraging that the University of the Western Cape is considering setting up a research centre to look into these questions. However, each university is set in a unique environment and can thus only itself determine a proper relationship both to the present and to the future order.

Finally, we need to train our people in the skills they will need to run this country after Apartheid. Obviously, this will be an immense and time-consuming endeavour. After apartheid South Africa will be an immensely complex society which will, hopefully, combine the best of what we now have with the manifold blessings of freedom.

We at the Institute of Social and Economic Research at Rhodes have secured funding for the establishment of an International Studies Unit which will train black South Africans, in particular, in the field of international relations. Regardless of the present situation, and whatever my colleagues in this field may think about the future, black people, for the most

part, will one day run this country's foreign policy.

The open universities face immense challenges: we can buckle under the short-term pressure which we face or, we can significantly contribute to the educational enrichment of our entire community. In W.H. Auden's words:

"the way is certainly sharp and steep
however far it looks from here,
look if you like,
but you will have to leap"

Peter Vale

4th September, 1986